

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed on August 18, 2009, claims 1-7 are rejected. In response, claims 1-7 have been amended. Additionally, new claims 8-10 have been added. Applicant hereby requests reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments, the new claims, and the below-provided remarks.

Abstract

The Office Action reminds the Applicant of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure. In response, the abstract has been amended to meet the requirements of the MPEP.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1, 6, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Kalevo et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2001/0017942 A1, hereinafter “Kalevo”). Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kalevo in view of Goldberg et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,963,203, hereinafter “Goldberg”). Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kalevo in view of Yasui et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,091,833, hereinafter “Yasui”). Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kalevo. However, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are patentable over the cited references for the reasons provided below.

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to remove hyphens. The amendment to claim 1 does not change the scope of the claim. Applicant respectfully asserts that Kalevo does not disclose “*dividing the large still picture into a set of pieces, said pieces having a size substantially equal to the display size*” (emphasis added), as recited in claim 1. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 1 is not anticipated by Kalevo.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Kalevo discloses dividing a digital image into blocks and performing spatial prediction on the blocks. (See the abstract and paragraphs [0006], [0016], [0017], [0019] of Kalevo). Kalevo further discloses two possible block sizes (8x8 or 4x4). (See paragraphs [0009] and [0070] of Kalevo). However, Applicant respectfully asserts that Kalevo does not disclose that the blocks have a size substantially equal to a display size. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that Kalevo does not disclose “*dividing the large still picture into a set of pieces, said pieces having a size substantially equal to the display size*” (emphasis added), as recited in claim 1. As a result, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 1 is not anticipated by Kalevo.

Dependent Claims 2-5 and 7

Claims 2-4 have been amended to replace the phrase “A method as claimed in” with the phrase “*The method of claim.*” Claim 5 has been amended to remove multiple dependency. Claim 7 has been amended to replace the phrase “a method as claimed in” with the phrase “*the method of claim.*” Claims 2-5 and 7 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 1. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 2-5 and 7 are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 1. Additionally, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 2 is allowable for further reasons, as described below.

Claim 2

Applicant respectfully asserts that Kalevo in view of Goldberg does not teach that “*the pieces of the large still picture overlap each other*” (emphasis added), as recited in claim 2. In particular, Applicant respectfully asserts that neither Kalevo nor Goldberg is cited for teaching the above-identified limitation in claim 2.

Kalevo is cited for teaching the limitations of claim 1. (See pages 5-7 of the Office Action). Goldberg is cited for teaching that “*the dividing and ranking steps are based on a traveling shot adapted to cover at least a part of the large still picture,*” as

recited in claim 2. (See page 7 of the Office Action). However, the Office Action does not state that either Kalevo or Goldberg teaches that “*the pieces of the large still picture overlap each other*” (emphasis added), as recited in claim 2. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that Kalevo in view of Goldberg does not teach the above-identified limitation in claim 2.

Independent Claim 6

Claim 6 has been amended to remove hyphens. The amendment to claim 6 does not change the scope of the claim. Claim 6 includes similar limitations in claim 1. Because of the similarities between claim 1 and claim 6, Applicant respectfully asserts that the remarks provided above with regard to claim 1 apply also to claim 6. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 6 is not anticipated by Kalevo.

New Claims 8-10

Claims 8-10 have been added. Support for claim 8 is found in Applicant’s specification at, for example, Fig. 1 and the paragraph between and page 3, line 32 and page 4, line 2. Support for claim 9 is found in Applicant’s specification at, for example, Fig. 3 and page 4, lines 21-23. Support for claim 10 is found in Applicant’s specification at, for example, page 4, lines 23-27. Claims 8-10 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 1. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 8-10 are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 1. Additionally, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 8-10 are allowable for further reasons, as described below.

Claim 8

The Office Action suggests that Kalevo discloses “*ranking the pieces of the large still picture according to a predetermined scanning order,*” as recited in claim 1. However, Applicant respectfully asserts that Kalevo does not disclose that “*the ranking step comprises scanning the large still picture from left to right, then from top to down, then from right to left*” (emphasis added), as recited in claim 8. As described above, Kalevo discloses dividing a digital image into blocks and performing spatial prediction on the blocks. Kalevo also discloses that blocks of the digital image are scanned from

top-left to bottom-right row by row. (See paragraphs [0034], [0038] and [0141] of Kalevo). However, Applicant respectfully asserts that Kalevo does not disclose that the blocks are scanned from left to right, then from top to down, then from right to left. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that Kalevo does not disclose that “*the ranking step comprises scanning the large still picture from left to right, then from top to down, then from right to left*” (emphasis added), as recited in claim 8.

Claim 9

The Office Action suggests that Yasui teaches “*a step of detecting contours within the large still picture,*” as recited in claim 3. New claim 9 depends from and incorporates all of the limitations of claim 3. However, Applicant respectfully asserts that Yasui does not teach that “*the contours belong to an object, and wherein the ranking step comprises scanning the contours from left to right and from top to bottom until the center of the object is reached*” (emphasis added), as recited in claim 9. Yasui teaches a lane contour detector (400) that detects the contour of a road from a perspective image (Vi) and that generates a road contour signal (Sre). (See column 6, lines 9-13 of Yasui). Yasui further teaches that the lane contour detector (400) also generates a region limiting signal (Sr) that limits a scanning area used for contour detection in the perspective image (Vi) that is scanned. (See column 6, lines 13-20 of Yasui). However, Applicant respectfully asserts that Yasui does not teach that the contour of a road is scanned from left to right and from top to bottom until the center of the road is reached. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that Yasui does not teach that “*the contours belong to an object, and wherein the ranking step comprises scanning the contours from left to right and from top to bottom until the center of the object is reached*” (emphasis added), as recited in claim 9.

Claim 10

Applicant respectfully asserts that Kalevo does not disclose “*the zooming step comprising: down-sampling the large still picture to generate a down-sampled picture, wherein the down-sampled picture has a lower resolution than the large still picture; and forming a final picture of the video sequence using the down-sampled picture,*” as recited in claim 10. The Office Action states that Kalevo does not teach “*a step of zooming a*

part of the large still picture,” as recited in claim 5. (See page 13 of the Office Action). Because claim 10 further limits “*a step of zooming a part of the large still picture,*” as recited in claim 5, Applicant respectfully asserts that Kalevo also does not disclose the above-identified limitation in claim 10. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 10 is not anticipated by Kalevo and is now in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the amendments and remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **50-4019** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **50-4019** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Date: November 11, 2009

Mark A. Wilson
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham
PMB: 348
2530 Berryessa Road
San Jose, CA 95132
Phone: (925) 249-1300
Fax: (925) 249-0111